REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated March 29, 2007, the claims have not been amended. Claims 1-24 remain in the application. Re-consideration of the application is requested.

II. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Autodesk, Inc., the assignee of the above-identified application, is the real party in interest.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-24 are currently pending.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected.

Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-24.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The claims have not been amended subsequent to the final Office Action.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claims 1, 7, and 13 are generally directed to enabling communication between disconnected applications (see paragraph [0003]- page 2, lines 11-14). More specifically, disconnected applications as used in the present invention and as explicitly claimed therein provide that a disconnected application is unaware of the secondary application (see paragraph [0007]-page 3, line 23-page 4, line 6; paragraph [0029]-page 10, lines 2-17; paragraph [0047]-page 15, lines 19-22; FIGs. 2, 3, 4, and 5). In this regard, the disconnected applications of the present invention are applications that do not know anything about each other. One application (referred to in the claims as a secondary application) creates a bridge object (FIGs. 4 and 5; paragraphs [0044]-[0045]-page 14, line 22-page 15, line 9). Such a bridge object is not part of either application and allows the applications to communicate with each other through an interface (paragraph [0049]-page 14, lines

10-15; FIGs. 4 and 5). In this regard, the claims explicitly provide that an interface for the bridge object enables communication with the secondary application through the bridge object (paragraph [0049]-page 14, lines 10-15; FIGs. 4 and 5). The interface for the bridge object is registered in a global interface table (GIT) and a cookie is retrieved (from the GIT) in response (paragraph [0048]-page 15, line 23-page 16, line 9; paragraph [0050]-page 16, line 16-page 17, line 3; paragraph [0053]; page 17, lines 14-21; FIGs. 4 and 5). Such a cookie comprises information for utilizing the interface for the bridge object. The claims then explicitly provide for storing the cookie in a location that is accessible to the disconnected application such that the cookie can be retrieved to enable use of the interface (paragraph [0048]-page 15, line 23-page 16, line 9; paragraph [0050]-page 16, line 16-page 17, line 3; paragraph [0053]; page 17, lines 14-21; FIGs. 4 and 5).

In view of the above-described limitations, there are several unique, novel, and nonobvious aspects of the invention. Such aspects include the storage of the cookie in any globally accessible location. The prior art fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the use or storage of the cookie whatsoever. A second aspect includes that the applications are disconnected/independent and are unaware of each other – yet can communicate via the bridge object. A third aspect is that the interface bridge object is not part of either application. A fourth aspect is that the interface placed in the GIT is from the bridge object, rather than from either application. Again, the applications have no direct connection to each other and are disconnected (yet can communicate via the bridge object and the information contained in the GIT).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Platform SDK: COM IGlobalInterface Table (IGlobalInterfaceTable) pages 1-2 in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0205734 to Srinivasan et al (Srinivasan).

VII. ARGUMENT

A. Claims 1-24 Are Patentable Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Platform SDK: COM IGlobalInterface Table (IGlobalInterfaceTable) pages 1-2 in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0205734 to Srinivasan et al (Srinivasan).

1. Independent Claims 1, 7, and 13

On pages (2)-(6) of the Office Action, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Platform SDK: COM IGlobalInterfaceTable (IGlobalInterfaceTable) and Srinivasan et al., U.S. Publication 2004/020734 (Srinivasan).

Specifically, claim 1, 7 and 13 was rejected as follows:

> As to claim 1, IGlobalInterfaceTable teaches a computer-implemented method for enabling communication between applications ("...any apartment...any other apartment..." page 1 line 3), comprising: creating a bridge object in a secondary application ("...an object..." page 1 line 1), wherein an interface for the bridge object enables communication with the secondary application through the bridge object ("...an interface..." page 1 line 1); registering the interface for the bridge object in a global interface table (GIT) ("Register..." page 1 lines 5/37-38, "...register..." page 2 line 5); retrieving a cookie from the GIT in response to the registration, wherein the cookie comprises information for utilizing the interface for the bridge object ("...a cookie..." page 2 line 6, "...get a cookie..." page 2 line 5); and storing the cookie in an environment variable, wherein the environment variable is accessible to a application such that the cookie may be retrieved to enable use of the interface ("...GetInterfacefaceFromglobal method...this cookie..." page 1 lines 39-41).
>
> IGlobalInterfaceTable is silent with reference to disconnected applications. Tock teaches disconnected applications ("...offline..." page 1 paragraph 0007, "...disconnected state..." page 9 paragraph 0096).
>
> Srinivasan teaches disconnected applications (Active X Components 135 page 1 paragraph 0008) and the disconnected application is unaware of the secondary application ("...cannot directly call..." page 1 paragraphs 0008/0011).
>
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tock and IGLobalInterfaceTable because the teaching of Tock would improve the system of IGLobalInterfaceTable by providing a method for allowing a client application to operate offline from a server (Tock page 1 paragraph 0007).
>
> As to claims 7 and 13, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Applicant traverses the above rejections for one or more of the following reasons:

(1) Neither IGlobalInterfaceTable nor Srinivasan teach, disclose or suggest the storage of the cookie in a location that is accessible to a disconnected application;

(2) Neither IGlobalInterfaceTable nor Srinivasan teach, disclose or suggest a disconnected application that is unaware of the secondary application; and

(3) Neither IGlobalInterfaceTable nor Srinivasan teach, disclose or suggest a secondary application and disconnected application executing within the same process but in different apartments.

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action primarily relies on the IGlobalInterfaceTable reference. Specifically, with respect to the storage of the cookie in a location accessible to the disconnected application (e.g., an environment variable), the Office Action refers to page 1, lines 39-41. Page 1, lines 37-41 provides:

> After calling the CoCreateInstance function, register the interface you want to make available processwide from the apartment in which it resides with a call to the RegisterInterfaceInGlobal method. This supplies a pointer to a "cookie" (through the *pdwCookie* parameter) that identifies the interface and its location. An apartment that wants a pointer to this interface then calls the GetInterfaceFromGlobal method with this cookie, and the implementation then supplies an interface pointer to the calling apartment. To revoke the interface's global registration, any apartment may call the RevokeInterfaceFromGlobal method.

As can be seen from this text (and the remainder of IGlobalInterfaceTable), there is no description, explicit or implicit, regarding the storage or what to do with the cookie. Instead, the reference merely describes the supplying of a pointer to a cookie that identifies an interface and its location. A method is then called with the cookie and an interface is supplied to a calling apartment. In this regard, the cookie of IGlobalInterfaceTable could merely be passing around the cookie as an argument to various functions. The present claims are unique in that the cookie of the claimed invention is stored in a location that is accessible to both the disconnected application and the secondary application. For example, the cookie could be stored in a globally accessible location such as a database, file system, or registry. The dependent claims explicitly provide that the location comprises an environment variable. Nowhere in IGlobalInterfaceTable is there any description, suggestion, or remote reference to the storing of the cookie in any location, not to mention the storage in an environment variable as claimed.

In response to the above, arguments, the final Office Action essentially repeats the rejections. Applicants again reassert that above and note that lines 39-41 of IGlobalInterfaceTable provide for supplying a pointer to a cookie that identifies the interface and its location. The "its location" modifies the term interface and describes the location of the interface. In this regard, the location described in IGlobalInterfaceTable does not refer to the location of the cookie itself. Such a location of a cookie is not contemplated in IGlobalInterfaceTable.

In view of the above, Applicants note that the present application addressed security issues that needed to be addresses because of the use of a web browser. To overcome the security limitations imposed by such a web browser, the particular use and method of the cookie and bridge were developed. Such a methodology did not exist in the past. In this regard, the IGlobalInterfaceTable reference clearly falls within the prior art and does not provide a method for accessing the bridge object or storing a cookie (containing information for such a bridge object) in a location that is accessible to a disconnected application. Again, IGlobalInterfaceTable completely fails to teach, disclose, or suggest, explicitly or implicitly, any storage of a cookie in a globally accessible location. In addition, the use and manner of use of the cookie is neither taught not disclosed in IGlobalInterfaceTable.

The Office Action continues and submits that IGlobalInterfaceTable is silent with respect to disconnected applications and the disconnected application being unaware of the secondary application. Instead, the Office Action relies on Srinivasan. Applicants respectfully traverse such an assertion. As set forth in the claim limitations, the disconnected applications of the present invention do not refer to applications that are merely unable to directly call each other. Instead, the claim limitations explicitly provide that the disconnected application is unaware of the secondary application. Srinivasan paragraph [0007] serves to actually teach away from such a limitation. In this regard, paragraph [0007] describes a COM client looking for a calculator through a Jini brokering service. In this regard, the COM client is explicitly aware of a calculator. In fact, the COM client searches by specifying GUIDs on behalf of a client. The Jini broker finds the desired activeX component and returns Java objects. Thus, contrary to that asserted in the final Office Action, the applications are clearly aware of each other.

Further, rather than utilizing a cookie to retrieve information for utilizing an interface for a bridge object, the Jini application merely wraps serialized object code as an ActiveX Java service so that it can be accessed by a COM application (see paragraph [0008]). Such a use is not even remotely relevant to the present claims. In this regard, wrapping up an object so that a COM application can use a Java object is not similar in any way, shape, or form, to the explicit and specific limitations set forth in the present application.

In addition to the above, Applicants note that the Jini application is a stand alone application rather than an application executing in a web browser or a project hosting environment (e.g., as in claim 2).

Further, the dependent claims provide that the applications are executing within a same process but in different apartments. Such terminology is wholly and completely lacking from Tock.

In addition to the above, the dependent claims provide for storing the cookie in an environment variable (see claims 19, 21, and 23). In rejecting these claims, the Office Action merely recites IGlobalInterfaceTable page 1, lines 38-41. Such a description does not even remotely reference an environment variable. In fact, Applicants submit that a use of an environment variable is not even contemplated or mentioned anywhere in IGlobalInterfaceTable. Again, the claims provide for explicit claim limitations. Under MPEP §2142 and 2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)." The Office Action cannot merely ignore the claim limitations directed towards environment variables and recite a location of an interface, which has no relevance with respect to the storage of a cookie.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicants' claimed invention together provide operational advantages over IGlobalInterfaceTable, Srinivasan, and Tock. In addition, Applicants' invention solves problems not recognized by IGlobalInterfaceTable, Srinivasan, and Tock.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 7, and 13 are allowable over IGlobalInterfaceTable, Srinivasan, and Tock. Further, dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 are submitted to be allowable over the cited references in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 recite additional novel elements not shown by the cited references.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth A. Vadella et al.

By their attorneys,

GATES & COOPER LLP

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: May 29, 2007

By: _____
Name: Jason S. Feldmar
Reg. No.: 39,187